Rights, Equality and Citizenship Programme

REC-AG-2019

UP4Diversity

TASK 2.1

Literature Review on Upstander Intervention & LGBT

D2.1. Report on Upstander intervention and LGBT

January 2021

Table of Contents

Structure of the Report

This literature review is part of the UP4Diversity project (WP2) and aims to summarize the main findings regarding existing practices in upstander interventions against LGBT+ violence and harassment. The report begins with an introduction that summarizes the need to create these tools to combat homophobia, transphobia and bullying directed at the LGBT+ community in educational settings. The introduction is followed by the methodology that clarifies the criteria for the final inclusion of articles in the dataset. The section on results and analysis presents the main outcomes of the literature review, including a presentation of case studies that stand out in the literature. The report ends with a conclusion section that summarizes the major findings and provides recommendations for exploitation of these results in upstander interventions that target LGBT+ bullying and harassment.

1. <u>Introduction</u>

Discrimination and violence against LGBT+[1] individuals have been well documented in the past few decades, both in academic literature (Meyer, 2015; Katz-Wise & Hyde, 2012; Mitchell, Ybarra & Korchmaros, 2014; Mogul, Ritchie, & Whitlock, 2011) as well as in EU surveys that have registered high levels of harassment, marginalization and violence in the experiences of the LGBT+ minority (FRA, 2014; FRA 2020). In fact, the FRA (2020) report states explicitly that comparison between the survey results of 2012 and 2019 shows that LGBT+ individuals continue to experience constant and everyday violations of their human rights. The report also notes that there were not enough indications that sufficient progress was achieved in the protection the LGBT+ community although the report cautions that the EU average does not reflect important differences between member states.

These phenomena have direct and long-term effects on the health and well-being of LGBT+ individuals (Almeida, Johnson, Corliss, Molnar & Azrael, 2009; Lick, Durso & Johnson, 2013; Mereish, O'Cleirigh & Bradford, 2014; Bauer, Scheim, Pyne, Travers & Hammond, 2015; Brennan, Irwin, Drincic, Amoura, Randal & Smith-Sallans, 2017; Mazrekaj, De Witte & Cabus, 2020). For example, sexual minority youth report high rates of harassment and victimization through threats and/or injuries with the use of a weapon (Bouris, Everett, Heath, Elsaesser & Neilands, 2016. Thus, they are more likely to skip school and to present suicidal ideation.

European level initiatives in the past two decades have sought to combat this problem at the policy level. For example, the 2006 European resolution on homophobia (European Parliament, 2006) called on member states to ensure that LGBT+ people are protected from violence and homophobic hate speech and urged them to engage in educational, administrative and

legislative campaigns against homophobia, especially in schools, universities and the media. Furthermore, the European Parliament Resolution (2014) "Roadmap against homophobia and discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity" recognized that a more concerted and comprehensive strategy is needed so that member states can ensure that the rights of LGBT+ individuals are respected, especially in education, health and employment.

Since 2014, the European Parliament's "LGBTI Intergroup," an informal forum, has been formed as an intermediary between civil society and the European Parliament. Its main objective is to monitor the status quo of LGBTIQ rights both in EU institutions and EU Member States and report, remind or advice when problematic LGBTQI-related issues arise. The first ever "LGBTIQ Strategy 2020-2025" was published in November 2020 in order to address the challenges affecting LGBTIQ individuals. The report reiterates the findings of the 2019 survey (FRA, 2020), and the worrying levels of increasing reports of discrimination against the LGBT+ community. More specifically, it states: "In a 2019 survey, the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) found that discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation, gender identity/expression and sex characteristics was actually increasing in the EU: 43% of LGBT people declared that they felt discriminated against in 2019, as compared to 37% in 2012." (European Commission, 2020, p. 3-4). The goal of the strategy is to focus specifically on the more vulnerable LGBT+ individuals and importantly to follow a multidimensional and intersectional approach.

Most concerning is the fact that schools and educational spaces are often breeding grounds for the type of bullying and sexual harassment that LGBT+ individuals experience (Juvonen & Graham, 2014; Kosciw, Palmer, Kull, & Greytak, 2013; Olsen, Kann, Vivolo-Kantor, Kinchen, & McManus, 2014). The European Commission (2020) strategy aims to develop comprehensive strategies in order to create supportive learning environments for LGBT+ individuals in order to

combat risks for underachievement and deterioration of mental health. More specifically, the "LGBTIQ Strategy 2020-2025" will: "address gender stereotypes in education, bullying and sexual harassment. In addition, the Commission's upcoming comprehensive Strategy for the rights of the child, will ensure indiscriminate access to rights, protection and services also for LGBTIQ children" (European Commission, 2020, p. 10).

The current literature shows that the problem of homophobic bullying and cyberbullying in educational spaces and youth organizations needs to be addressed early on in order to prevent the spread of marginalization (Elipe, de la Oliva Muñoz & Del Rey, 2018; Rodríguez-Hidalgo, & Hurtado-Mellado, 2019). Research has confirmed that a school climate that is non-acceptant, the lack of a supportive social network as well as the absence of LGBT+ movements in the community are related to higher rates of suicidality in LGBT+ youth (Poštuvan, Podlogar, Šedivy & De Leo, 2019). These reports confirm that unsupportive reactions by others contribute to the internalization of homophobia, biphobia and transphobia by LGBT+, thus, leading to depression and suicidal ideation.

There are also indications that empowering young people to become allies of the LGBT+ community and intervene in situations of harassment and violence is an effective tool towards this goal (Dessel, Goodman & Woodford, 2017; Della Cioppa, O'Neil & Craig, 2015; Villarejo-Carballido, Pulido, de Botton & Serradell, 2019). The aim of this report is to conduct a thorough literature review on the state-of-the-art regarding training and implementation of "upstander" interventions where young people assert their ability to intervene in situations of violence against LGBT+ individuals instead of being mere bystanders. Results on the methods and impact of these training interventions will be used as a starting point in designing the UP4Diversity "upstander" intervention.

It is important to clarify how this report uses the underlined terminology of "upstander" intervention. Most of the literature reviewed here uses the term "bystander" to refer to individuals that observe bullying, harassment and other acts of violence but fail to act. In some cases, the term "active bystander" was used to indicate individuals who decided to intervene in order to interrupt the aggressive acts or to support the victim. This report uses the term "upstander" instead of "active bystander" to suggest a better distinction from the phenomenon of a "bystander" and to attribute a more positive connotation to their acts. Indeed, given that some "active bystanders" may act with complicity in order to further incite violence and encourage the aggressor, it is important to provide a term that does not add to the confusion. Existing research that maintains this divide between a bystander and an upstander has also attempted to examine different typologies of upstanders and bystanders based on their motivation, level of moral reasoning and perception of self-efficacy (see for example, Olweus & Limber, 2010; Graeff, 2014; Shultz, Heilman & Hart, 2014; Beer, Hawkins, Hewitson & Hallett, 2019).

2. <u>Methodology</u>

The goal of this literature review was to collect evidence of the the *social impact* of initiatives based on upstander interventions in the prevention, reduction or overcoming of LGBT+ violence in youth populations. In this case, social impact is defined as "when the published and disseminated research results, which have been transferred, lead to an improvement [of society] in relation to the goals agreed in our societies (through our political representatives)" (IMPACT-EV, 2015, p. 1).

In order to achieve these goals, a literature search was conducted in scientifically valid and peer-review databases such as Web of Science and Scopus. Priority was given to articles

published in peer-review journals in the last 10 years. All partners in the project focused initially on searching results from their own states (Spain, Belgium, Cyprus, Denmark) in order to provide a review that includes relevant data that can potentially be more easily applied at the local level. Subsequently, the partners covered literature from other areas around the world as follows: KU Leuven on North America, URV on South America, UCY & Accept on Asia and CFDP on Africa.

The literature review was guided by search criteria: a set of keywords agreed upon initially and then enriched after a preliminary search. These keywords were also translated into national languages in order to search relevant databases. The review was conducted using inclusion and exclusion criteria in order to ensure uniformity in the quality of results. The keywords and inclusion/exclusion criteria were as follows:

- Keywords
    o LGBT* (LGBTI, LGBTIQ, LGBT+) LGBT* violence, LGBT* bullying, homophobia, prejudice, transphobia, heterosexism, homophobic violence, homophobic bullying, homophobic discrimination
    o Youth, students, high school, secondary school, pupil, intervention
    o Upstander, bystander

- Inclusion Criteria
    o Empirical studies
    o Target countries
    o Analysis of changes in prevalence, attitudes and perceptions of lgbt violence/discriminations based on upstander/bystander intervention (community approach??)

- Exclusion Criteria
  - o Articles with a methodological aim, that exclusively explain instruments for data collection
  - o Theoretical articles and literature reviews (except if they are systematic literature reviews analysing the impact of upstander intervention in LGBT youth)

All partners conducted thorough literature searches based on the above criteria and generated lists of proposed articles for inclusion in the literature review. The list of articles was cross-checked in order to avoid overlaps. A total of <u>41 articles</u> fulfilled the criteria and were included in the review. Three articles that fulfilled the criteria but were published before 2010 were included because they presented case studies of interventions that added different perspectives to the literature. Out of the 41 articles, 39 presented specific case studies in different counties and the remaining 2 were literature reviews that fulfilled the criteria. The distribution of 39 case studies in different countries was as follows:

Case study articles per country
20 USA
10 Spain
4 Belgium
1 Germany
1 Italy
1 Portugal
1 Canada
1 Mexico

Each partner elaborated a summary of each article on a template (see Annex 1) in order to provide material for the literature review. UCY, the lead partner in this task, gathered all the article summaries and assembled the results of the literature review.

3. Results and Analysis

Review of the literature shows that homophobic bullying and harassment of LGBTIQ youth is a widespread phenomenon with detrimental and long-term effects on their health and well-being (Almeida, Johnson, Corliss, Molnar & Azrael, 2009; Toomey, Ryan, Diaz, Card & Russell, 2013; Kosciw, Greytak, Bartkiewicz, Boesen & Palmer, 2012). At the same time, there is a growing literature that shows how interventions to disrupt bullying by training "upstanders" contributes both to the reduction of bullying as well as the mitigation of its harmful effects (Caravita, Di Blasio & Salmivalli, 2009; Salmivalli, Voeten & Poskiparta, 2011). This section summarizes the main themes of the literature before paying attention to particular case studies of upstander interventions that have resulted in positive social impact.

3.1   General characteristics of Upstander Interventions

Upstander interventions focus mostly on children and youth, usually involving teenagers (Ortega, Del Rey & Mora-Merchán, 2004; Farley, Gallagher & Richardson Bruna, 2020) and university students (Gorrotxategi, Ozamiz-Etxebarria, Jiménez-Etxebarria & Cornelius-White, 2020). There are also interventions that involve teachers because their ability to teach and influence young people is seen as key in upstander training. Therefore, most interventions take place in educational settings (middle school, high school, university) and target incidences of bullying among classmates. Overall, there is evidence that creating a safer climate and training "active bystanders" or "upstanders" plays an important role in decreasing bullying incidents, especially in the school environment (Ortega, Del Rey & Mora-Merchán, 2004).

The success of upstander interventions is generally registered in the promotion of a sense of community and peaceful coexistence as this is evident in team work, the signing of agreements and references by students to concepts such as equality and solidarity (González-Alonso, Guillén-Gámez, & de Castro-Hernández, 2020; Ortega, Del Rey & Mora-Merchán, 2004). Another common approach for these interventions is to foster students' self-esteem and empathy (González-Alonso, Guillén-Gámez, & de Castro-Hernández, 2020). According to a metanalysis conducted by Vera, Hill and Daskalova (2018), empathy training has direct applications for reduction of bullying and for the promotion of upstanding behaviour. High levels of empathy were also found to be associated with more defending behaviours (Nickerson, Aloe, & Werth, 2015; Zych et al., 2019).

Most of these training interventions are preventive and encourage young people to plan their own future intervention method (Banyard, Moynihan & Plante, 2007; Gorrotxategi, Ozamiz-Etxebarria, Jiménez-Etxebarria & Cornelius-White, 2020; Ortega, Del Rey & Mora-Merchán, 2004). The opportunity to consider one's reaction to witnessing bullying and to devise a plan of action is seen as key for young people's ability to actually carry out this intervention once it becomes necessary. Furthermore, Sarmiento, Herrera-López and Zych (2019) showed that approaches to defending the victim is an important factor and it must be included in the trainings. Finally there are also indications that upstander training should include information and support in case they experience Second Order Sexual Harassment (SOSH) (Vidu, Valls, Puigvert, Melgar & Joanpere, 2017). SOSH takes place when the upstander or the person trying to support the victim is targeted by the bully. Upstander training needs to account for this possibility and prepare young people accordingly.

Interventions utilize a variety of techniques to accomplish their goal. For example, one approach is to use exercises that focus on communication and coexistence, and involve the whole community (González-Alonso, Guillén-Gámez & de Castro-Hernández, 2020). These communicative activities aim to develop students' self-esteem and empathy skills, and also build a feeling of coexistence. Debates, role playing, teamwork, agreements and individuals' own planning are some of the most common activities and techniques which appear in upstander interventions (Granero Andújar & Manzano León, 2018; Banyard, Moynihan & Plante, 2007). Through these techniques, students have the ability to gain knowledge, be critical against norms (Granero Andújar & Manzano León, 2018) practice their own method and improve their active bystander attitude (Farley, Gallagher & Richardson Bruna, 2020). Other techniques include the use of stories and case studies which provide the opportunity to educate students about feelings, attitudes, and values which in turn foster discussions on respect and solidarity (Ortega, Del Rey & Mora-Merchán, 2004).

Among these techniques, role playing appears more often in upstander interventions (Ahrens, Rich & Ullman, 2011; Granero Andújar & Manzano León, 2018; Ortega, Del Rey & Mora-Merchán, 2004). This includes the development of a scenario of bullying and violence where the young person is asked to "act out" and "rehearse" their intervention as an upstander (Banyard, Moynihan & Plante, 2007). This technique helps students to test, refine and experience the upstander behavior in a safe context. Given that one of the obstacles in carrying out such an intervention is the sense of risk involved, this approach is considered particularly effective (Banyard, Moynihan & Plante, 2007).

Additionally, signing an agreement is another common technique in upstander training, found in 5 of the studies. The agreement explains briefly concepts related to bullying—for example, respect and equality—establishes rules and uses a democratic approach which allows the members of the community to decide what is considered acceptable behaviour (Granero Andújar & Manzano León, 2018; Ortega, Del Rey & Mora-Merchán, 2004; Martín & Bolaños, 2019; González-Alonso, Guillén-Gámez & de Castro-Hernández, 2020; Ahrens, Rich & Ullman, 2011). Creating a safe space where everyone can express their opinion and where every perspective is taken into consideration can positively affect the intervention's target (Villarejo-Carballido, Pulido, de Botton, & Serradell, 2019). Finally, approaches which focus on explaining the causes, consequences and prevalence of bullying, as well as the importance of active bystanders' role seem to also have positive impact on combating bullying (Banyard, Moynihan & Plante, 2007).

3.2   Successful Upstander interventions from the literature on bullying

The upstander interventions presented in this section are based on the rich literature on bullying which took off in the 1990s through research that offered insights on the interpersonal dynamics of this phenomenon (Olweus, 1994; Rigby, 2002; Sharp & Smith, 2002). During the past 20 years, the phenomenon of bullying became recognized as a problematic feature of school life and several programs were designed around the world, aiming to provide successful interventions. Although this literature does not refer specifically to gender or sexual orientation it is a useful starting point because it provides useful resources and practical guidelines in anti-bullying and anti-violence approaches in schools, especially with regards to the upstander intervention model. Overall, the literature provides evidence that upstander interventions have a positive impact both on teachers and students, seem to decrease the prevalence of bullying and create a safer school environment. In addition, the most important methodological issue regarding research on "active bystander" or "upstander" interventions is to find ways to

measure the impact of the training, both short-term and long-term. Some of the most successful upstander programs in terms of their impact are the following:

SAVE Model

The SAVE Model developed by Ortega, Del Rey & Mora-Merchán (2004) is an intervention that aimed to raise awareness through seminars and help teachers create their own intervention plan. The program used pre and post-training evaluations and compared results with a control group of schools. The program involved training in democratic management of social relationships which was given the best evaluation. Furthermore, students noted that training for direct intervention with victims was the best approach for reducing bullying. Education in feelings and values was also evaluated very positively, although a considerable number of students thought that it had no effect. The strategies of direct intervention with bullies, and work on co-operative groups had lower positive ratings.

Results of the intervention following the SAVE Model showed that it successfully decreased the rates of students who were bullies [from 4.5% (N = 41) to 3.8% (N = 34)], victims [from 9.1% (N = 83) to 3.9% (N = 35)] and/or both [from 0.7% (N = 6) to 0.3% (N = 3)]. Furthermore, the SAVE model intervention resulted in a rise in active bystanders, [from 85.7% (N = 780) to 92.1% (N = 838)]. Additionally, willingness to become a bully and the feeling of isolation and silence were also reduced. Overall, the approached increased the likelihood that the bystander would consider the bully's behavior as problematic and it resulted in more satisfaction with the school environment and relationships between students. The report notes that by the end of the intervention, the school was a safer space and actions of bullying were significantly diminished. It is worth noting that, following these results, schools in Andalusia, Spain requested the implementation of the SAVE model or similar interventions to take part in their schools.

The Improvement of Coexistence and Communicative Competence (ICCC) model

ICCC uses communicative and other relevant activities that improve students' self-esteem and empathy in order to foster positive school coexistence through verbal and non-verbal interactions (González-Alonso, Guillén-Gámez, & de Castro-Hernández, 2020). The overall goal is to develop student's abilities in linguistic communication and civic learning. It is based on teaching values such as tolerance, equality, respect, and empathy and focuses on the diversity of the students. The intervention also educates students on how bullying involves everyone, not just the victim and the perpetrator; therefore, noting the importance of intervening as an upstander.

The approach was quasi experimental (pre and post-test), designed between 2017 and 2018, which examined 55 Spanish students' perceptions about bullying and level of conflict. Results showed that ICCC model activities, resulted in diminishing students' perception of bullying dominance. It also resulted in decreasing conflict in the school and improving relationships among students. At the same time, results suggested the need for longitudinal implementation of the programme to improve school coexistence and social skills of students from the early stages of education.

Upstanding for Justice Heuristic (UJH)

The Upstanding for Justice Heuristic (UJH) aims to help students understand the meaning of upstanding. In order to expand the idea of "upstanding," researchers used a university honors course to pilot the UHJ and investigate bullying and historical injustice based on Nancy Fraser's theory of justice (Farley, Gallagher & Richardson Bruna, 2020). It is considered to be a tool that helps students historicize, contextualize and discover broader factors that influence upstanding behaviors. Participants in this honors course titled "Upstanders for Justice" had to build their own heuristic idea which should be based on the subject of injustice that they are willing to

upstand for. Students were encouraged to consider their identities as upstanders for justice and to use historical inquiry tools such as primary sources and historical thinking analysis questions. Thus, students were taught historical methods in analyzing historical texts and artifacts while at the same time preparing their ability to identify upstanding behavior and considering its impact in a sociocultural context.

Evaluation evidence, collected through course assignments posted at university's blackboard, indicates that students showed a better understanding of justice, had expanded their concept of justice, and realized the importance of creating an upstander plan. Overall, the UJH seems to work as a map or as a guide for contemporary upstanding. First of all, it offers a new understanding of the power of historical thinking strategies, such as contextualizing and considering perspective, to help students contemplate upstanding behavior. Furthermore, UJH provides empirical evidence of theoretical claims about how upstanding behaviour is more than an interpersonal action. Lastly, UJH expands the ways in which bullying and school climate literature conceptualizes work necessary to combat bullying behaviour in schools and offers evidence of undergraduates' engagement with those new conceptualizations. At the same time, researchers noted some limitations: for example, students tend to focus on individual upstanding rather than collective upstanding and only few participants made a connection between system and oppression.

Dialogic Model of Prevention and Resolution of Conflicts (DMPRC)

The DMPRC model has two aims: first, to build a safe space where school members can communicate effectively in order to combat bullying and violence of any type and, second, to create a coexistence agreement as a roadmap for the community (Villarejo-Carballido, Pulido, de Botton & Serradell, 2019). The DMPRC is not an isolated dynamic or a scheduled activity, but

a new way of understanding relationships, based on egalitarian dialogue and dialogic learning. It is based on the extensively studied preventive socialization of gender violence (Gómez, 2015).

To achieve these goals, the school creates a commission with members from the whole community to ensure that the above targets have been accomplished. Results of the application of this model, which emerged from documentary analysis, communicative observations, and in-depth interviews, show three significant impacts: first, applying DMPRC contributed to breaking the silence surrounding bullying because it empowered students to condemn it. Second, the model created a safe and trusted environment where adults' intervention is more effective, and children have more confidence to admit any case of (cyber)bullying within and without school place. Third, active solidarity was achieved among victims and bystanders and re-victimization was successfully prevented. An important conclusion in this approach is that a zero-tolerance approach and the involvement of the whole community are important factors in the success of upstander interventions.

3.3 Successful Upstander interventions from the literature on gender-based violence

The 1993 UN General Assembly recognized violence against women as a major problem in societies around the world and adopted the Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women (A/RES/48/104). The declaration states that violence against women is "any act of gender-based violence that results in, or is likely to result in, physical, sexual or psychological harm or suffering to women, including threats of such acts, coercion or arbitrary deprivation of liberty, whether occurring in public or in private life" (United Nations, 2021). Currently, there is a recognition that forms of gender-based violence impact not only women but also LGBTIQ+ individuals who may be seen as not conforming to patriarchal ideals of gender norms. Furthermore, violence against women and sexist attitudes are often closely associated with homophobia and transphobia (Pharr, 1997). Findings from research on gender-based violence

show that heteronormative understandings of gender are behind many incidents of harassment, bullying and abuse in educational settings (Meyer, 2015; Messerschmidt, 2012; Wickens & Sandlin, 2010). Thus, it is important to consider how <u>findings from upstander research on gender-based violence/violence against women can inform current approaches on upstander interventions against the LGBTIQ+ community</u>.

<u>Green Dot Programme</u>

The Green Dot program is a bystander intervention program that aims at cultivating skills and behaviors that support community mobilization for incidents of gender-based violence in educational settings. Green Dot took off in 2006 as a sexual assault, domestic violence and stalking-prevention program at the University of Kentucky and it has since been systematically reviewed and evaluated through research (Coker, Cook-Craig, Williams, Fisher, Clear, Garcia & Hegge, 2011; Coker, Bush, Fisher, Swan, Williams, Clear & DeGue, 2016; Coker, Bush, Cook-Craig, DeGue, Clear, Brancato & Recktenwald, 2017).

According to Coker et.al, (2016) and Coker et.al., (2017), the Green Dot program contributed to the reduction of interpersonal violence, unwanted sexual victimization, sexual harassment, stalking, and psychological dating violence victimization and perpetration. More specifically, Coker et.al, (2016) used a cross-sectional survey of a random sample of 7,945 college undergraduates in order to analyse the association between having received Green Dot active bystander behaviour training and reporting behaviour that contributed to intervening in situations of victimization. The Coker et.al., (2017) methodology collected data from Kentucky high schools which were randomized to intervention or control (wait list) conditions and a total of 89,707 students completed a survey.

The program evaluation used different scales to measure university students' violence acceptance (for example, the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (IRMA) and the Acceptance of General Dating Violence Scale) in order to evaluate reduction of these attitudes. Coker et.al (2011) found that rape myth acceptance among trained students decreased and, simultaneously, there was an increase in active bystander behaviour. In another evaluation of Green Dot (Coker et al (2016), researchers found that campuses where the training was implemented reported lower violence victimization rates (17% lower) by the students attending the intervention relative to comparison campuses. Similarly, violence rates were also lower for the intervention campuses compared to the comparison campuses on issues such as unwanted sexual victimization, sexual harassment, stalking and psychological dating violence victimization and perpetration. Overall, the program is associated with significantly higher active bystander rates compared to the control group. Green Dot is considered to be an effective intervention in reducing violence at the community level and it meets the Campus Sexual Violence Elimination Act bystander training requirements.

interACT Sexual Assault Prevention Program

This programme focuses on rape prevention and aims to increase a person's probability of engaging in an active bystander intervention by training them to do that effectively. In order to accomplish its target, based on Augusto Boal's (1985) Theatre of the Oppressed, individuals have to watch two life-scenarios related with rape and toxic masculinity played by trained actor-educators, and then, participants must become an active individual by taking part in those real-life scenarios on stage. This helps them to identify whether their own method is effective or not and how they can improve it, their critical thinking and they learn useful techniques in a safer space. With the contribution of all these, a future upstander is created (Ahrens, Rich & Ullman, 2011).

Evaluation of the program stemmed from pre pro test and follow up surveys. Results showed that the majority of students believed that getting involved in a bystander intervention would have a positive impact in rape prevention, despite the fact that the self-reported likelihood of engaging in bystander interventions ratio were moderate. Interestingly, participants for whom the likelihood of engaging in bystander interventions was increasing over time, reported at the beginning lower rates of initial beliefs about the helpfulness of bystander interventions and vice versa. In conclusion, bystander intervention programs could still have a positive impact through the years, especially for those who had lower initial beliefs about the efficacy of bystander interventions and intentions to be actively involved as a bystander. In addition, participants' ratings of bystander interventions as helpful in preventing rape (particularly from pretest to posttest) were significantly elevated.

Community Responsibility model

Another study (Banyard, Moynihan & Plante, 2007) examined a sexual violence prevention program based on a community of responsibility model that teaches individuals to intervene safely and effectively during, before and after a case of sexual violence which involves a known/an unknow person. It approaches both sexes as potential bystanders or witnesses to behaviors related to this kind of violence. The program offers basic information about the prevalence, causes, and consequences of sexual violence, as well as discussions of how community members can play important role as active bystanders when observing risky situations, before and during acts of sexual violence. It also addresses the question of how to respond when/if approached by a friend who discloses that they are a victim. Active learning was also included, for example, participants had to create a bystander plan and a pledge. The study had a treatment and a control group.

According to the outcomes, through questionnaires, participants who have taken part in the programme reported an improvement in their helping attitude and prosocial bystander attitudes, knowledge, bystander efficacy and self-reported bystander behaviors. Also, rape myth acceptance was lower comparing it with students in control group. Follow-up paired sample t-tests showed increase in reported bystander behaviour from pretest to 2 months. Large effect sizes were found for both genders in contrast with previous research.

<u>Poster Campaign</u>

Another study (Potter, Moynihan, Stapleton & Banyard, 2009) followed an ecological approach to evaluate whether a poster campaign increased the knowledge of prosocial bystander behaviours and the observers' desire to intervene in a sexual violence incident. First, a media campaign on sexual and intimate partner violence was designed in order to inform the public and address rape myths. Second, evaluation tools were employed to assess the campaign's community impact. The campaign focused on the idea that everyone plays a role in sexual prevention. Using students as actors, posters modeled prosocial community-oriented behaviors related to those presented in a bystander education programme. This study followed a qualitative approach, conducting focus groups and a pilot study to collect its data.

Results showed that a poster campaign might raise awareness about sexual assault in the community. Furthermore, there was a rise in scores of willingness to intervene and contemplation because of the campaign. Additionally, participants who claimed having seen the posts, seemed to have remarkably ($p < .05$) higher action-stage scores, in contrast with those who had not. The study also concluded that provocative imagery might have a positive impact on reduction of Sexual Violence, norms, and rape culture because it can stimulate contemplation. In other words, poster campaign can lead the college students into thinking why

preventing sexual violence and creating an intervention plan is important in order to decrease it.

Overall, a meta-analysis of bystander education training for campus sexual assault prevention (Katz & Moore, 2013) has showed moderate effects on Bystander efficacy and intentions. This meta-analysis evaluated the effectiveness of bystander education programmes related to sexual assault prevention which have taken place in a higher education institution. Apart from the overall efficacy of the interventions there were also small but significant effects regarding self-reported bystander helping behaviours, (lower) rape-supportive attitudes, and (lower) rape proclivity.

The authors conclude that there is ample evidence to support the effectiveness of in-person bystander education training (Katz & Moore, 2013). A significant number of students declared that they are empowered to help others and willing to portray a helping role after attending a single training programme. Overall, there was an increased report on bystander efficacy, bystander intention and actual bystander behaviour and a decrease in rape myths acceptance and rape tendency. Also, focusing on positive and transformative behaviour (bystander) and learning about how a bystander can intervene seems to have a better impact that focusing on negative and exclusionary events/actions (rape). This means that bystander training programmes seem to be more effective in promoting bystander efficacy and intent to help others compared to other programs that simply focus on informing participants on the prevalence and incidence of sexual assault.

3.4 Successful Upstander interventions related to the LGBT community

Research related to upstander interventions that address violence against the LGBTIQ+ community, shows that measures such as inclusive education, visibility of LGBTIQ+ individuals, democratic approach and community approach seem to be necessary in order to create a safer space. More importantly, it provides a forum to break the silence surrounding these incidents and to publicly condemn bullying incidents. Some of the main conclusions from the literature that includes the LGBTIQ+ community in upstander interventions are the following:

A. Community interventions and inclusive educational environments.

One of the enduring issues for LGBTIQ+ youth is the issue of safety. The research shows that safety improves when a program creates an inclusive environment that involves the whole community. In a literature review, Domínguez-Martínez and Robles (2019) examined international interventions/programs focused on reducing bullying and promoting inclusion. According to the review, structural interventions are required to accomplish reduction of violence against transgender people. Also, a variety of changes must occur in order to create schools that are protective and secure learning environments for LGBTIQ+ students. The interventions mentioned in the review, include universal prevention programs in school environment which involve the whole school community (teachers, students, families) and aim, firstly, to prevent LGBT bullying and secondly, intervene on the behalf of those who have already been LGBT bullying targets.

In another review, Sanchez and Teixido (2016) point out that recognition, awareness, and training are important aspects of LGBT bullying prevention. They emphasize that anti-bullying programs need to address specific issues of gender-based violence and LGTBphobia. The review

also highlights the need to include scientific evidence for the effectiveness of these interventions. This review mentions the need of a whole community and democratic approach in school context as preventive factors, especially the use of a dialogic model of conflict resolution that uses egalitarian dialogue as its basis. The importance of a dialogic approach was also confirmed by Villarejo-Carballido, Pulido, de Botton & Serradell (2019) who studied the effectiveness of prevention programmes that include the active role of a bystander. The evidence suggests that applying this type of model might contribute to overcoming cyberbullying. Specifically, children seem to feel more confident in rejecting violence, students support the victims more and the whole community has a Zero Tolerance attitude toward violence. Its positive impact in reducing violence and creating safe spaces and better relationships explains why this model has been implemented to hundreds of schools in Spain, Europe, and Latin America so far.

B. LGBTIQ+ safe spaces are related to fewer reported bullying incidents

In an evaluation of the SOGI online course, Russell, Day, Ioverno & Toomey (2016) focused on teachers' perception about the SOGI programme. This programme allows students to investigate their own attitudes and values related to Gender and Sexual identity. The curriculum is divided in six sections and educates students on how to define and differentiate sexual orientation from gender identity, explain sexual- and gender-related human rights and incorporate SOGI into research in a culturally appropriate way in various international settings. The review showed a correlation between having an LGBTQ safe space, with fewer reported bullying incidents.

These results point to the importance of creating safe spaces in the context of school safety, but also suggest that the presence of multiple policies may have more influence than any single policy on its own. This could be supported by other studies (Kosciw et al., 2014; O'Shaughnessy et al., 2004) which depict that SOGI-focused policies and practices create positive environments for all students and have an impact in reducing bullying. These policies, according to research (e.g., Poteat et al., 2013, 2014) matter to all students and not solely to LGBT.

These findings are also supported by a review of the Finnish KiVA anti-bullying program (Granero Andújar & Manzano León, 2018). The review concludes that the KiVA programme showed a significant reduction in homophobic-transphobic bullying and school violence. KiVa elements are common with effective measures against LGBT-based bullying from scientific articles. Due to the positive impacts of this programme it appears in various schools in Finland and in the rest of Europe.

C.   Upstander programs need to engage with gender and transgender issues

In a recent study, Gorrotxategi, Ozamiz-Etxebarria, Jiménez-Etxebarria & Cornelius-White (2020) analyzed the interactive training program "Creative Factory" which focuses on gender and transgender learning. The program contributed to the improvement of Social Education students' knowledge and attitudes toward any type of gender. That might suggest that similar trainings could advance students' future professional response. The main goal of this methodology is to enable students to analyze social realities to generate discussion. According to Parcerisa-Aran and Forés (2003) and Bas-Peña et al. (2014) "learning programs on transgender issues improve both knowledge and attitudes toward transgender people. For this reason, the importance of promoting training courses on gender and transgender for

professionals so that they can act and intervene both in educational spaces and in family, work and community spaces is highlighted".

D. The LGBTIQ+ community and intersectional approaches

In a recent study, McMahon, Burnham & Banyard (2020) examined the perspectives of racialized and/or LGBTQ spectrum university students regarding bystander interventions on campus related to sexual violence, dating violence, and other forms of harm. Results suggest that intersectionality and social justice aspects must be included in bystander intervention efforts. The participants' ability to identify various forms of discrimination resulted from active bystander interventions on campus. Students highlighted the ways that their identities are intertwined with their ability to be active bystanders on college campuses.

4. Conclusions

Upstander interventions are a successful way to address violence and harassment against the LGBTIQ+ community. The evidence suggests that these programs tend to reduce bullying overall and to create a safe and positive environment for all students. Given the literature overall, the following features in an upstander training addressing LGBTIQ+ violence are important:

1. Positive models on upstander role

All successful anti-bullying programs that address either bullying in general or forms of gender-based violence include an educational section that informs students on the problems faced by victims of bullying and violence. However, feedback from students seems to indicate that including positive models of upstander behavior that allow participants to think about their

active role in intervening in these situations is a more effective approach (Katz & Moore, 2013). In other words, programs need to allow participants to plan, imagine and rehearse their own plan of action in order to envisage how they would respond to a situation of violence against LGBTIQ+ individuals (see also Farley, Gallagher & Richardson Bruna, 2020). This means that the upstander approach is essential in anti-bullying programs.

2. Emphasis on Empathy

One of the issues that has come up consistently in these interventions is the balance between condemning bullying by pointing out its exclusionary aspects and educating about positive and transformative behaviors (Katz & Moore, 2013). The issue of empathy and the question of how to teach empathy and solidarity is a consistent theme in the literature (Caravita, Di Blasio & Salmivalli, 2009; Nickerson, Aloe & Werth, 2015; Zych, Baldry, Farrington & Llorent, 2019). Findings show that while it is important to hold critical debates on what is violence, it is also important to cultivate pedagogically the meaning and the behaviors associated with solidarity, friendship and empathy.

3. Community involvement

Results also strongly suggest that the involvement of the whole community that is associated with the educational institution—students, teachers, parents—is an important factor in the success of these programs because they take into account the norms and attitudes that support and justify violence against the LGBTIQ+ community. The community approach means that everyone within the community is considered to play an important role in preventing bullying incidents (Banyard, Moynihan & Plante, 2007). It also implies that not only the student needs to be part of the training but also the whole family (e.g., DeSmet, et.al., 2014). This community approach needs to address issues of solidarity and support among all the members (Sanchez, &

Teixido, 2016). More importantly, interventions that require the participation of the whole community go beyond the idea that bullying and violence is an interpersonal issue and emphasize the idea that <u>bullying is systemic and requires everyone's participation and action</u> (Farley, Gallagher & Richardson Bruna, 2020). In general, the community approach should open up <u>dialogic spaces</u> (Villarejo-Carballido, Pulido, de Botton & Serradell, 2019) that will allow members to share their experiences, validate the perspective of others and agree democratically on how to handle situations of bullying and harassment.

4. <u>Clarity on rules</u>

Upstander interventions need to allow the community to debate and implement a set of clear rules on what is considered appropriate behavior. A community may rely on a zero tolerance approach (Villarejo-Carballido, Pulido, de Botton & Serradell, 2019) but it should nevertheless be clear on the rules. Agreements signed by students or the mapping of clear rules for one's behavior also seem to help young people navigate others' behavior and call it out if necessary (Granero Andújar & Manzano León, 2018).

5. <u>Upstander approaches need to be intersectional</u>

The response of the LGBT+ community that also includes racial minorities shows that addressing violence and bullying should engage intersectional approaches (McMahon, Burnham & Banyard, 2020). Furthermore, in addition to classic issues of homophobia, these upstander trainings need to address the phenomenon of transphobia as there is emerging recognition that the trans community is particularly vulnerable to violent attacks (Gorrotxategi, Ozamiz-Etxebarria, Jiménez-Etxebarria & Cornelius-White, 2020).

In conclusion, this field of research is still an emerging field and more research needs to be conducted to reach conclusive guidelines in terms of the most effective approaches in upstander training against LGBTIQ+ violence. Some remaining points to consider about the literature overall are the following:

(a) There is a need to <u>diversify results of these upstander trainings in different contexts</u>. As Crooks, Jaffe, Dunlop, Kerry & Exner-Cortens (2019) note, the majority of the research results (80%) on gender-based violence prevention programs has been conducted in only a handful of countries that represent 6% of the world population. Given that underlying gender norms and cultural attitudes are an important factor in the success of these programs, it is important to investigate the implementation and evaluation of upstander trainings in different countries.

(b) Given the centrality of technology in our lives today and the fact that the phenomenon of bullying has also expanded into cyberbullying, it is important to <u>consider the role of technology not only in multiplying incidents of violence but also in upstander training to intervene in such incidents</u>. There is already some evidence that there can be successful training of upstanders in cyberbullying (Sarmiento, Herrera-López and Zych, 2019). There are also examples of online training such as the case of the SOGI online training program (Russell, Day, Ioverno & Toomey, 2016) which shows that it is effective in educating participants on issues of gender identity and sexual orientation.

(c) A major issue in the evaluation of these programs is the question of methodology (Katz and Moore, 2013), not only in terms of uniformity across studies but also in terms of measuring the short-term and long-term effects of the upstander training. Researchers emphasize (see Sanchez and Teixido, 2016) that more needs to be done to ensure that upstander training is effective not only in terms of the self-reported change in attitudes but in participants' behavior as well.

5. <u>References</u>

Ahrens, C. E., Rich, M. D., & Ullman, J. B. (2011). Rehearsing for real life: The impact of the InterACT Sexual Assault Prevention Program on self-reported likelihood of engaging in bystander interventions. *Violence Against Women*, 17(6), 760-776. doi: [10.1177/1077801211410212](https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801211410212)

Almeida, J., Johnson, R. M., Corliss, H. L., Molnar, B. E., & Azrael, D. (2009). Emotional distress among LGBT youth: The influence of perceived discrimination based on sexual orientation. *Journal of youth and adolescence*, 38(7), 1001-1014. doi: [10.1007/s10964-009-9397-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-009-9397-9)

Baldry, A.C.; Farrington, D.P.; Sorrentino, A.; Blaya, C. *Cyberbullying and cybervictimization. In International Perspectives on Cyberbullying*; Palgrave Macmillan: Cham, Switzerland, 2018; pp. 3–23.

Banyard, V. L., Moynihan, M. M., & Plante, E. G. (2007). Sexual violence prevention through bystander education: An experimental evaluation. *Journal of community psychology*, 35(4), 463-481. doi.org/10.1002/jcop.20159

Bas-Peña, E., Pèrez-de-Guzmàn, V., and Vargas, M. (2014). Educacioìn Y geìnero. formacioìn de los educadores y educadoras sociales. Pedagog. Soc. Rev. Interuniver. 23:95. doi: 10.7179/PSRI-2014.23.05.

Bauer, G. R., Scheim, A. I., Pyne, J., Travers, R., & Hammond, R. (2015). Intervenable factors associated with suicide risk in transgender persons: a respondent driven sampling study in Ontario, Canada. *BMC public health*, 15(1), 525. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-015-1867-2

Beer, P., Hawkins, C., Hewitson, D., & Hallett, F. (2019). Perpetrators, victims, bystanders and upstanders: cyberbullying in a special school context. *Support for Learning*, 34(3), 340-356. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9604.12259

Beins, B. C., & McCarthy, M. A. (2018). *Research methods and statistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Boal, A. (1985). *Theatre of the oppressed* (C. A. McBride & M. O. L. McBride, Trans.). New York: Theatre Communications Group.

Bouris, A., Everett, B. G., Heath, R. D., Elsaesser, C. E., & Neilands, T. B. (2016). Effects of victimization and violence on suicidal ideation and behaviors among sexual minority and heterosexual adolescents. *LGBT health*, 3(2), 153-161. doi.org/10.1089/lgbt.2015.0037

Brennan, S. L., Irwin, J., Drincic, A., Amoura, N. J., Randall, A., & Smith-Sallans, M. (2017). Relationship among gender-related stress, resilience factors, and mental health in a Midwestern US transgender and gender-nonconforming population. *International Journal of Transgenderism*, 18(4), 433-445. doi.org/10.1080/15532739.2017.1365034

Caravita, S. C., Di Blasio, P., & Salmivalli, C. (2009). Unique and interactive effects of empathy and social status on involvement in bullying. *Social development*, 18(1), 140-163. doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9507.2008.00465.x

Coker, A. L., Bush, H. M., Cook-Craig, P. G., DeGue, S. A., Clear, E. R., Brancato, C. J., & Recktenwald, E. A. (2017). RCT testing bystander effectiveness to reduce violence. American journal of preventive medicine, 52(5), 566-578. doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2017.01.020

Coker, A. L., Bush, H. M., Fisher, B. S., Swan, S. C., Williams, C. M., Clear, E. R., & DeGue, S. (2016). Multi-college bystander intervention evaluation for violence prevention. American journal of preventive medicine, 50(3), 295-302. DOI:10.1016/j.amepre.2015.08.034

Coker, A. L., Cook-Craig, P. G., Williams, C. M., Fisher, B. S., Clear, E. R., Garcia, L. S., & Hegge, L. M. (2011). Evaluation of Green Dot: An active bystander intervention to reduce sexual violence on college campuses. *Violence against women*, 17(6), 777-796.). https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801211410264

Dahl HM, Stoltz P and Willig R (2004) Recognition, redistribution and representation in capitalist global society: an interview with Nancy Fraser. *Acta Sociologica* 47(4): 374–382. doi.org/10.1177/0001699304048671

Della Cioppa, V., O'Neil, A. & Craig, W. (2015). Learning from traditional bullying interventions: A review of research on cyberbullying and best practice. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 23, 61–68. doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2015.05.009

Dessel, A. B., Goodman, K. D., & Woodford, M. R. (2017). LGBT discrimination on campus and heterosexual bystanders: Understanding intentions to intervene. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 10(2), 101–116. doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000015

Domínguez-Martínez, T., & Robles, R. (2019). Preventing transphobic bullying and promoting inclusive educational environments: literature review and implementing recommendations. *Archives of medical research*, 50(8), 543-555. doi.org/10.1016/j.arcmed.2019.10.009

Edwards, K. M., Sessarego, S. N., Mitchell, K. J., Chang, H., Waterman, E. A., & Banyard, V. L. (2020). Preventing teen relationship abuse and sexual assault through bystander training:

Intervention outcomes for school personnel. *American journal of community psychology*, 65(1-2), 160-172. doi.org/10.1002/ajcp.12379

Elipe, P., de la Oliva Muñoz, M., & Del Rey, R. (2018). Homophobic bullying and cyberbullying: Study of a silenced problem. *Journal of homosexuality*, 65(5), 672-686. doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2017.1333809

European Commission (2020). "LGBTIQ Strategy 2020-2025," https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/lgbtiq_strategy_2020-2025_en.pdf

European Parliament. (2006). European Parliament resolution on homophobia in Europe. P6_TA(2006)0018. Belgium. Retrieved from http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+TA+P6-TA-2006-0018+0+DOC+XML+V0//EN

European Parliament. (2014). Roadmap against homophobia and discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity. P7_TA(2014)0062. Belgium. Retrieved from https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52014IP0062&from=GA

Farley, J., Gallagher, J., & Richardson Bruna, K. (2020). Disrupting narrow conceptions of justice: Exploring and expanding 'bullying 'and 'upstanding 'in a university honors course. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 15(3), 258-273. doi.org/10.1177/1746197919853808

FRA, Fundamental Rights Agency (2014). *EU LGBT survey: Main results*. https://doi.org/10.2811/37969

FRA, Fundamental Rights Agency (2020). A long way to go for LGBTI Equality. https://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra_uploads/fra-2020-lgbti-equality-1_en.pdf

Gómez, J. (2015). *Radical Love. A Revolution for the 21st Century*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

González-Alonso, F., Guillén-Gámez, F. D., & de Castro-Hernández, R. M. (2020). Methodological Analysis of the Effect of an Anti-Bullying Programme in Secondary Education through Communicative Competence: A Pre-Test–Post-Test Study with a Control-Experimental Group. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 17(9), 3047. doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17093047

Gorrotxategi, M. P., Ozamiz-Etxebarria, N., Jiménez-Etxebarria, E., & Cornelius-White, J. H. (2020). Improvement in gender and transgender knowledge in university students through the Creative Factory methodology. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 367. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00367

Graeff, E. (2014). Tweens, cyberbullying, and moral reasoning: Separating the upstanders from the bystanders. In *Communication and Information Technologies Annual*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited. doi/10.1108/S2050-206020140000008016

Granero Andújar, A., & Manzano León, A. (2018). (Possibilities of the KiVa program to face homophobic and transphobic bullying) Posibilidades del programa KiVa para hacer frente al bullying homofóbico y transfóbico. Revista Complutense De Educación, 29(4), 943-958. https://doi.org/10.5209/RCED.54346

Hong, L. (2017). Digging up the roots, rustling the leaves: A critical consideration of the root causes of sexual violence and why higher education needs more courage. In J. C. Harris & C. Linder (Eds.), *Intersections of identity and sexual violence on campus: Centering Prev Sci* (2020) 21:795–806 805 minoritized students' experiences (pp. 23–41). Sterling: Stylus Publishing, LLC.

IMPACT-EV. (2015). Research Briefing. Social Impact of Research. Recuperat de http://impact-ev.eu/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/research_briefing.pdf

Juvonen, J., & Graham, S. (2014). Bullying in schools: The power of bullies and the plight of victims. *Annual review of psychology*, 65, 159-185. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010213-115030

Katz, J., & Moore, J. (2013). Bystander education training for campus sexual assault prevention: An initial meta-analysis. *Violence and victims*, 28(6), 1054-1067. DOI: 10.1891/0886-6708.VV-D-12-00113

Katz-Wise, S. L., & Hyde, J. S. (2012). Victimization experiences of lesbian, gay, and bisexual individuals: A meta-analysis. *Journal of sex research*, 49(2-3), 142-167. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2011.637247

Kosciw, J. G., Greytak, E. A., Bartkiewicz, M. J., Boesen, M. J., & Palmer, N. A. (2012). *The 2011 National School Climate Survey: The experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender youth in our nation's schools*. Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education Network (GLSEN). 121 West 27th Street Suite 804, New York, NY 10001.

Kosciw, J. G., Greytak, E. A., Palmer, N. A., & Boesen, M. J. (2014*). The 2013 National School Climate Survey: The experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender youth in our nation's schools*. New York: GLSEN.

Kosciw, J. G., Palmer, N. A., Kull, R. M., & Greytak, E. A. (2013). The effect of negative school climate on academic outcomes for LGBT youth and the role of in-school supports. *Journal of School Violence*, 12(1), 45-63. doi.org/10.1080/15388220.2012.732546

Koss, M. P., Wilgus, J. K., & Williamsen, K. M. (2014). Campus sexual misconduct: Restorative justice approaches to enhance compliance with title IX guidance. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 15, 242–257. doi.org/10.1177/1524838014521500

Lick, D. J., Durso, L. E., & Johnson, K. L. (2013). Minority stress and physical health among sexual minorities. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 8(5), 521-548. doi.org/10.1177/1745691613497965

Martín, J. M., & Bolaños, J. A. C. (2019). Assessing the effect of the Cordoba Peer Support Program on fostering Social Competence and reducing the Bullying. *Aula abierta*, 48(2), 221-228.). doi.org/10.17811/rifie.48.2.2019.221-228

Mazrekaj, D., De Witte, K., & Cabus, S. (2020). School outcomes of children raised by same-sex parents: Evidence from administrative panel data. *American Sociological Review*, 85(5), 830-856. https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122420957249

McMahon, S., Burnham, J., & Banyard, V. L. (2020). Bystander Intervention as a Prevention Strategy for Campus Sexual Violence: Perceptions of Historically Minoritized College Students. *Prevention Science*, 1-12. Doi: 10.1007/s11121-020-01134-2

Menesini, E., Nocentini, A., & Palladino, B. E. (2012). Empowering students against bullying and cyberbullying: Evaluation of an Italian peer-led model. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence* (IJCV), 6(2), 313-320. doi.org/10.4119/ijcv-2922

Mereish, E. H., O'Cleirigh, C., & Bradford, J. B. (2014). Interrelationships between LGBT-based victimization, suicide, and substance use problems in a diverse sample of sexual and gender minorities. *Psychology, health & medicine*, 19(1), 1-13. doi.org/10.1080/13548506.2013.780129

Messerschmidt, J. W. (2012*). Gender, heterosexuality, and youth violence: The struggle for recognition*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Meyer, D. (2015). *Violence against queer people: Race, class, gender, and the persistence of anti-LGBT discrimination*. Rutgers University Press.

Meyer, E. J. (2009). *Gender, bullying, and harassment: Strategies to end sexism and homophobia in schools*. Columbia University, NY: Teachers College Press.

Mitchell, K. J., Ybarra, M. L., & Korchmaros, J. D. (2014). Sexual harassment among adolescents of different sexual orientations and gender identities. *Child abuse & neglect*, 38(2), 280-295. doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2013.09.008

Mogul, J. L., Ritchie, A. J., & Whitlock, K. (2011). *Queer (in) justice: The criminalization of LGBT people in the United States* (Vol. 5). Beacon Press.

Navarro, R.; Larrañaga, E.; Yubero, S. Gender identity, gender-typed personality traits and school bullying: Victims, bullies and bully-victims. *Child Indic. Res*. 2006, 9, 1–20. Doi: 10.1007/s12187-015-9300-z

Nickerson, A. B., Aloe, A. M., & Werth, J. M. (2015). The relation of empathy and defending in bullying: A meta-analytic investigation. *School Psychology Review*, 44, 372–390. https://doi.org/10.17105/spr-15-0035.1

Olsen, E. O. M., Kann, L., Vivolo-Kantor, A., Kinchen, S., & McManus, T. (2014). School violence and bullying among sexual minority high school students, 2009–2011. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 55(3), 432-438. doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2014.03.002

Olweus, D. (1994). *Bullying at school. In Aggressive behavior* (pp. 97-130). Springer, Boston, MA. Doi: 10.1007/978-1-4757-9116-7_5

Olweus, D., & Limber, S. P. (2010). Bullying in school: evaluation and dissemination of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program. *American journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 80(1), 124. doi.org/10.1111/j.1939-0025.2010.01015.x

Ortega, R., Del Rey, R., & Mora-Merchán, J. A. (2004). SAVE model: An anti-bullying intervention in Spain. *Bullying in schools: How successful can interventions be*, 167-186.

O'Shaughnessy, M., Russell, S., Heck, K., Calhoun, C., & Laub, C. (2004). *Safe place to learn: Consequences of harassment based on actual or perceived sexual orientation and gender non-conformity and steps for making schools safer*. San Francisco, CA: California Safe Schools Coalition.

Parcerisa-Aran, A., and Forés, A. (2003). Didáctica y educación social: ¿una convivencia llena de posibilidades? *Educ. Soc*. 25, 71–84.

Pharr, S. (1997). *Homophobia: A weapon of sexism*. Berkeley, CA: Chardon Press.

Poštuvan, V., Podlogar, T., Šedivy, N. Z., & De Leo, D. (2019). Suicidal behaviour among sexual-minority youth: a review of the role of acceptance and support. *The Lancet Child & Adolescent Health*, 3(3), 190-198. doi.org/10.1016/S2352-4642(18)30400-0

Poteat, V. P., Sinclair, K. O., DiGiovanni, C. D., Koenig, B. W., & Russell, S. T. (2013). Gay–straight alliances are associated with student health: A multischool comparison of LGBTQ and

heterosexual youth. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 23, 319–330. doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-7795.2012.00832.x

Poteat, V. P., Yoshikawa, H., Calzo, J. P., Gray, M. L., DiGiovanni, C. D., Lipkin, A., ... Shaw, M. P. (2014). Contextualizing gay–straight alliances: Student, advisor, and structural factors related to positive youth development among members. *Child Development*, 86(1), 176–193. doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12289

Potter, S. J., Moynihan, M. M., Stapleton, J. G., & Banyard, V. L. (2009). Empowering bystanders to prevent campus violence against women: A preliminary evaluation of a poster campaign. *Violence Against Women*, 15(1), 106-121. doi.org/10.1177/1077801208327482

Rigby, K. (2002). *New perspectives on bullying*. Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Rodríguez-Hidalgo, A. J., & Hurtado-Mellado, A. (2019). Prevalence and psychosocial predictors of homophobic victimization among adolescents. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 16(7), 1243. doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16071243

Russell, S. T., Day, J. K., Ioverno, S., & Toomey, R. B. (2016). Are school policies focused on sexual orientation and gender identity associated with less bullying? Teachers' perspectives. *Journal of School Psychology*, 54, 29–38. doi:10.1016/j.jsp.2015.10.005

Salmivalli, C., Voeten, M., & Poskiparta, E. (2011). Bystanders matter: Associations between reinforcing, defending, and the frequency of bullying behavior in classrooms. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology*, 40(5), 668-676. doi.org/10.1080/15374416.2011.597090

Sanchez, E. D., & Teixido, J. (2016). Bullying and gender. Prevention from school organization. *Multidisciplinary Journal of Educational Research*, 6(2), 176-204. doi.org/10.17583/remie.2016.2108

Sarmiento, A., Herrera-López, M., & Zych, I. (2019). Is cyberbullying a group process? Online and offline bystanders of cyberbullying act as defenders, reinforcers and outsiders. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 99, 328-334. doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2019.05.037

Sharp, S., & Smith, P. (2002). *School bullying: Insights and perspectives*. Routledge.

Shultz, E., Heilman, R., & Hart, K. J. (2014). Cyber-bullying: An exploration of bystander behavior and motivation. *Cyberpsychology: Journal of Psychosocial Research on Cyberspace*, 8(4). doi.org/10.5817/CP2014-4-3

Storer, H. L., Casey, E. A., & Herrenkohl, T. I. (2017). Developing "whole school" bystander interventions: The role of school-settings in influencing adolescents' responses to dating

violence and bullying. *Children and youth services review*, 74, 87-95.
doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2017.01.018

Toomey, R. B., Ryan, C., Diaz, R. M., Card, N. A., & Russell, S. T. (2013). Gender-nonconforming lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender youth: school victimization and young adult psychosocial adjustment. Doi: 0.1037/a0020705

United Nations (2021), United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women, "Violence Against Women," https://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/vaw/v-overview.htm, Accessed January 18, 2021.

Vera, E., Hill, L. & Daskalova, P. (2018). Promoting Upstanding Behavior in Youth: A Proposed Model. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 39(7), 1020-1049. Doi: 10.1177/0272431618798514

Vidu, A., Valls, R., Puigvert, L., Melgar, P., & Joanpere, M. (2017). Second Order of Sexual Harassment – SOSH. *Multidisciplinary Journal of Educational Research*, 7(1), 1-26. doi: 10.17583/remie.2017.2505

Villarejo-Carballido, B., Pulido, C. M., de Botton, L., & Serradell, O. (2019). Dialogic Model of Prevention and Resolution of Conflicts: Evidence of the Success of Cyberbullying Prevention in a Primary School in Catalonia. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 16(6), 918. doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16060918

Wickens, C. M., & Sandlin, J. A. (2010). Homophobia and heterosexism in a college of education: A culture of fear, a culture of silence. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 23(6), 651-670. doi.org/10.1080/09518390903551035

Zych, I., Baldry, A. C., Farrington, D. P., & Llorent, V. J. (2019). Are children involved in cyberbullying low on empathy? A systematic review and meta-analysis of research on empathy versus different cyberbullying roles. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 45, 83–97.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2018.03.004

ANNEX 1

TASK 2.1. Literature Review on Upstander Intervention & LGBT

Table for literature review (sample)

Reference	Country	Characteristics of the Upstander Intervention	Context of implementation (and details of the sample)	Impacts achieved
Coker, A. L., Bush, H. M., Clear, E. R., Brancato, C. J., & McCauley, H. L. (2020). Bystander program effectiveness to reduce violence and violence acceptance within sexual minority male and female high school students using a cluster RCT. Prevention science, 21(3), 434-444.	*USA*	*Educators provided school-wide Green Dot presentations (phase 1) and intensive bystander training to student popular opinion leaders (phase 2).* *Each spring from 2010 to 2014, students completed anonymous surveys about violence acceptance and violent events.* *Etc.*	*26 Kentucky high schools* *74,836 surveys over the 5 years* *All students (grades 9–12) who could provide consent were invited* *University of Kentucky IRB approved the study protocol. Each year letters describing the study were mailed to the parents of all students.*	*Significant declines in sexual violence acceptance over time (Table 2, mean school-level IRMA scores) were observed in the sexual majority male subgroup (CxT; p = .02), sexual majority females (CxT; p = .004), and sexual minority female subgroup (CxT; p = .03).* *Etc.*

---

[1] This report utilizes the acronym LGBT+ to refer inclusively to Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans individuals as well as other identities such as Queer, Intersex and Asexual. Different organizations use this acronym differently: the Human Rights Campaign uses LGBTQ (https://www.hrc.org/resources/glossary-of-terms) and ILGA Europe LGBTI (https://www.ilga-europe.org/sites/default/files/glossary_october_2015_edition.pdf). Given that most of the articles reviewed in this report use the LGBT acronym as a minimum reference to the queer community we follow the same format and include the plus (+) sign to indicate that we embrace other self-identifications not explicitly noted by the studies reviewed here.